

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. **FILING DATE** Hiroshi Sakai 15574 4405 10/063,915 05/23/2002 **EXAMINER** 23389 7590 05/10/2006 SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC JOHNSON, JONATHAN J 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530 1725

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/063,915	SAKAI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Johnson	1725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a			
Period for Reply			
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perioder and the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ate, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Seply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03	March 2006.		
,	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ers, prosecution as to the merits is	;
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Victorial of Claims			
Disposition of Claims	A	, :	
4) Claim(s) 1,4,6-7 is/are pending in the applica			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn nom consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1,4,6 and 7</u> is/are rejected.	Y.		
7) Claim(s) <u>1,4,0 and 7</u> is/are rejected.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
	4		
Application Papers		ì	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to th			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			i).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		.	
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	, p, aa a. a		
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri			
application from the International Bure			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	st of the certified copies not	received.	
		·	
Attachment(s)			
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	Summary (PTO-413) S)/Mail Date	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	-: C	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/063,915

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US 6,036,084 (Yagi). AAPA teaches a first process for mounting a mask having apertures corresponding to land portions of a printed circuit board, on said printed circuit board at a predetermined position thereof in a state where it is placed in position (specification, paragraphs 5-7); a second process for mounting a solder paste containing therein as a solder material a tin-zinc (Sn--Zn) system solder on said mask and for permitting said solder paste to make rolling from one end of said mask toward the opposite end thereof by means of a squeegee (specification, paragraph 12) wherein said squeegee urges said solder paste to make rolling, to thereby fill said solder paste into said apertures; and a third process for separating said mask away from said printed circuit board (figure 2c, item 250). Yagi teaches controlling the moisture content of the air using air to a predetermined value (col. 4, 1l. 30-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the screen printing process of AAPA to utilize controlling the moisture content of the claimed range in order to limit the moisture absorption by the solder paste (see Yage col. 1, 1l. 50-65). In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Application/Control Number: 10/063,915

Art Unit: 1725

at the time of the invention to choose the instantly claimed ranges through process optimization, since it has been held that there the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See <u>In re</u>

<u>Boesch</u>, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's affidavit (shown as Fig. 1), while informative, is improper because it has not been submitted in proper affidavit form. "The reason for requiring evidence in declaration or affidavit form is to obtain the assurances that any statements or representations made are correct, as provided by 35 U.S.C. 25 and 18 U.S.C. 1001." Ex parte Gray, 10 USPQ2d 1922, 1928 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989).

In addition, applicant's affidavit is not commensurate in scope with the claims. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., where the moisture is equal to or less than 10 g/m3 suppresses the increase in viscosity of the solder paste which is caused by the reaction in the Zn in the tin-zinc system solder) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Application/Control Number: 10/063,915 Page 4

Art Unit: 1725

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725